

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,043	FOOS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Josiah Cocks	3749	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Josiah Cocks (USPTO). (3) _____.

(2) Tait Swanson (applicant's representative). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 September 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Proposed rejection, not currently of record to claims 61-66 on the basis of the prior art of record U.S. Patent No. 2,709,446 to Miller and U.S. Patent No. 2,666,479 to Clinton

Claims discussed:

61-66

Prior art documents discussed:

Miller and Clinton

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


JOSIAH C. COCKS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss a proposed rejection to claims 61-66. The examiner indicated that the body and valve described in this claim read on the valve structure shown in Miller. The examiner admitted that the device of Miller was not a torch and thus did not anticipate applicant's recitation of a system comprising a torch comprising the body and valve recited in applicant's claim 61. However, after further consideration the examiner proposed that a rejection of claims 61-66 would be proper on the basis of the substitution of the valve of Miller into the torch of Clinton would be a matter of combining the prior art to yield the predictable result of a torch having a valve as recited in claims 61-66. The examiner proposed incorporating the limitations of claim 67 into claim 61 to result in a system comprising a torch having a body, valve and valve passage structurally distinct from the prior art of record and thus overcome an obvious type rejection to claims 61-66. Applicant's representative agreed to an examiner's amendment incorporating the limitations of claim 67 into claim 61 and cancelling claim 67.